

AND, the **Order dated January 22, 2010** also having prohibited the Plaintiff from filing any further motions to reconsider or amended motions to reconsider “in connection with” the **Order dated December 28, 2009**;

AND, thereafter the Plaintiff having filed still another motion styled as a “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10” (emphasis added) (Docket Entry No. 420);

AND, despite the fact that the latest Motion was filed in violation of the **Order dated January 22, 2010**,¹ the court having reviewed its content;

AND, after review of the “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10,” the court concluding that it presents no valid argument for reconsideration of any of the prior Orders;

It is therefore, **ORDERED** that:

1. The “Motion to Reconsider the Court's Order of 1/20/10” (Docket Entry No. 420) is **DENIED**.
2. The Plaintiff is **PROHIBITED** from filing any further motions to reconsider or amended motions to reconsider in connection with the December 28, 2009 Order or any subsequent Orders entered denying reconsideration.



Date: January 28, 2010

ERIC L. FRANK
U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE

cc: Thomas W. Olick
4014 Crestview Avenue
Easton, PA 18045

¹ Because it is likely that the Plaintiff was unaware of the prohibition imposed by the Order dated January 22, 2010, I will not consider imposing sanctions at this time. However, the Plaintiff is now on notice of the prohibition and no further violations this court's Orders will be tolerated. To the extent that the Plaintiff is dissatisfied with the outcome of these adversary proceedings, he should address his complaints to the appellate courts.